## SECRETARY OF THE ARMY ENVIRONMENTAL AWARDS PROGRAM DETAILED SCORING SHEET

A. PROGRAM MANAGEMENT: Rate the following on a scale of 0-5

| <ol> <li>Did the nominee demonstrate improvement during the period under consideration?</li> <li>Was there a recognized management structure in place to effectively manage mission environmental aspects? (Note that third party registration of the management system is not a DoD policy requirement.)</li> <li>Did the program demonstrate substantive involvement with other internal</li> </ol> | /5<br>/5 |
|---|----------|
| mission environmental aspects? (Note that third party registration of the management system is not a DoD policy requirement.)   | /5       |
| 3. Did the program demonstrate substantive involvement with other internal  |          |
| offices, e.g., funds manager, master planner, real property manager, utilities engineer, logisticians etc.?   | /5       |
| 4. Were all required plans prepared and are they up-to-date?  | /5       |
| 5. Did the nominee clearly identify program milestones?   | /5       |
| 6. Did the nominee demonstrate cost savings and military benefits?  | /5       |
| Total Score for Program Management  | /30      |

| Notes: |      | <br> |                                       |  |
|--------|------|------|---------------------------------------|--|
|        |      |      |                                       |  |
|        | <br> | <br> | · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · |  |
|        |      |      |                                       |  |

B. TECHNICAL MERIT: Rate the following on a scale of 0-5

| 6. Did the program promote more efficient use of resources?  Total Score for Technical Merit   | /5 |
|--|----|
| 5. While enhancing one sector of the environment, did the program ensure other parts of the environment were not subjected to real or potential hazards? | /5 |
| 4. Did the program preferentially target source reduction of waste and harmful discharges and emissions?   | /5 |
| 3. Was the program effective in protecting, enhancing, and/or restoring the environment?   | /5 |
| 2. Of the techniques used, were any successfully demonstrated?   | /5 |
| 1. Did the nominee use innovative techniques and good judgment?  | /5 |

| Notes: |      |  |
|--------|------|--|
|        |      |  |
|        | <br> |  |
|        |      |  |
|        |      |  |

## C. ORIENTATION TO MILITARY READINESS or CIVIL WORKS MISSION:

Rate the following on a scale of 0-5 /5 1. Did the program or environmental management system demonstrate substantive involvement of individuals directly responsible for the military readiness, as appropriate for the accomplishments cited in the nomination package? Or Did the program or environmental management system demonstrate OR substantive involvement of individuals directly responsible for the civil works /5 mission, as appropriate for the accomplishments cited in the nomination package? 2. Did the program contribute to the successful execution or enhancement of the /5 nominee's military readiness/civil works mission? 3. Did the program help identify and develop "mitigation measures" as /5 necessary? Were these measures effective? **Total Score for Orientation to Military Readiness/Civil Works Mission** /15 Notes: D. TRANSFERABILITY: Rate the following on a scale of 0-4 1. Can others adopt this program elsewhere within and/or outside of DoD? /4 2. Did the nominee demonstrate progress in transferring innovations to others /4 within and outside of DoD? 3. Will program results outlive the presence of the specific individual(s) /4 responsible for the program's success? **Total Score for Transferability** /12 Notes:

## **E. STAKEHOLDER INTERACTION**

**US NOMINATIONS ONLY:** Rate the following on a scale of 0-2

| 1. | Did the program interact with the surrounding community, state and local regulators, non-governmental organizations, etc?                            | /2  |
|----|--|-----|
| 2. | Did the nominee establish volunteer and partnership programs? Were the contributions of these partners identified?                                   | /2  |
| 3. | Did the nominee develop public and in-house environmental education programs? Community outreach programs?   | /2  |
| 4. | Did the program promote public access?   | /2  |
| 5. | Did the program include substantive opportunity for public involvement and two-way communication?  | /2  |
| OV | YERSEAS NOMINATIONS ONLY: Rate the following on a scale of 0-10  | Or  |
| 6. | Did the program achieve success in enhancing environmental awareness and community involvement for base personnel and residents of military housing? | /10 |
| То | tal Score for Community Interaction  | /10 |

| Notes: | <br> | <br> |  |
|--------|------|------|--|
|        |      |      |  |
|        | <br> | <br> |  |
|        |      |      |  |

## Calculate the grand total by adding up the total scores from sections A-E

| A. Program Management                     |      |  |
|---|------|--|
| B. Technical Merit                        | /30  |  |
| C. Military readiness/civil works mission | /15  |  |
| D. Transferability                        | /12  |  |
| E. Stakeholder Interaction                | /10  |  |
| BONUS POINTS –                            |      |  |
| For First choice overall add 3pts         |      |  |
| Overall Total                             | /100 |  |